

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/578,498 | PARDONGE ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| JONATHAN WOOD | 3754 | |

All Participants:

(1) JONATHAN WOOD

Status of Application: Non-Finally Rejected

(3) _____.

(2) Ryan Heavener.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 March 2010

Time: 10 AM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1, 4-6, 20

Prior art documents discussed:

Penn, Maerte

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/JKW/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3754

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated to applicant that newly amended claim 1 could still be rejected based on the prior art of record and based on art found in examiner's previous search. However, examiner further indicated that the limitation in newly added claim 20 regarding the four parts of the device being integrally molded pieces was a critical element to distinguish applicant's art over the prior art and that if included into claim 1, the application would be in condition for allowance. Applicant agreed to allow examiner to include the limitations of claim 20 into claim 1 via examiner's amendment and consequently cancel claim 20. Examiner further noted that claims 4-6 are improper claims since, after the amendment, they do not further limit the parent claim (their limitations are all included in amended claim 1) and they will therefore be cancelled. The application is now in condition for allowance. .